DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 701 HE 002 321

TITLE	A Report to the President from the Committee on the Status of Professional Women at Yale.
INSTITUTION	Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn.
PUB DATE	May 71
NOTE	44p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel, College Faculty, Doctoral Degrees, Employment Opportunities, Employment Practices, *Females, Higher Education, *Social Discrimination, *Women Professors
IDENTIFIERS	*Yale University

ABSTRACT

The Committee on the Status of Professional Women at Yale was charged by the University's President "to review the present participation of women in teaching and administration at Yale, to explore ways of increasing the participation of women under existing policies, and to suggest revisions in existing policies and procedures in order to increase such participation." This report concludes that an unacceptably high number of women at Yale do not reach the professional fulfillment to which their training ought to entitle them. Women receive 14 percent of the doctorates, but account for only 3 percent of the appointments at assistant professor rank or above in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The absence of women at the administrative level is equally glaring. Twenty-six recommendations are made to help remedy this situation. A brief discussion of the special problem of the research associate is included in the appendix, as well as tables indicating the number and percent of women students, Ph.D.'s, and faculty in 11 major departments. (AF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED052701

A Report to the President

from

the Committee on the Status of Professional Women at Yale

I. Introduction

II. General recommendations

III. Graduate study and placement

IV. Hiring--problems and opportunities

V. Professional women at Yale

VI. Summary of recommendations

Appendix I. The special problem of the Research Associate

Appendix II. Departmental statistics

Membership of the Committee on the Status of Professional Women at Yale:

Burton R. Clark

Ruth S. Day

Rhetaugh G. Dumas

Thomas M. Greene, Chairman

Dorothy M. Horstmann

Etta S. Onat

Ellen A. Peters

Keith S. Thomson

Elga R. Wasserman

Researcher:

Elizabeth L. Frederick

I. Introduction

The Committee on the Status of Professional Women at Yale was appointed by President Brewster in September, 1970. It was charged by him "to review the present participation of women in teaching and administration at Yale, to explore ways of increasing the participation of women under existing policies, and to suggest revisions in existing policies and procedures in order to increase such participation." The Committee has met almost weekly throughout the 1970-71 school year, and presents herewith its report.

Before formulating its recommendations, the Committee felt obliged to inform itself in a variety of ways. With the help of a researcher, we have compiled statistics on the past and present participation of women, both as students and faculty, throughout the university. We have written to various members of the Yale community asking for their analyses of women's present status and suggestions for the future. Specifically, we have solicited letters from the deans of all Yale schools and from the chairmen of all departments. We have also solicited letters, and received about 200 replies, from faculty members, professional women at Yale, as well as women who are now, or recently have been, students in Yale's graduate and professional schools. We have attempted to inform ourselves about the steps being taken to increase the participation of women at other universities, and about the recommendations of committees elsewhere with charges similar to our own. We have also attempted to follow the growing literature on professional women and have met with an authoress with a professional interest in this field. We have had a meeting with the Steering Committee of the Professional Women's Forum at Yale, as well as discussions, either singly or as a body, with several Yale officials whose responsibilities affect in various ways the status of Yale women. Above all we have attempted among ourselves to wrestle with the intricacies of the problem and to reach something like agreement on its potential remedies.

Our first conclusion, and perhaps our most important, is that a genuine problem does in fact exist. Even if one chooses to disregard the rising murmur of discouragement and bitterness from individual women, even if one chooses to consider coolly the present situation in terms of Yale's own self-interest, it must be admitted that a serious problem exists. As the situation now stands, an unacceptably high fraction of advanced students at Yale do not reach the professional fulfillment to which their training ought to entitle them. One crude but instructive means to measure women's professional achievement is to compare the percentage of women now teaching on the academic ladder in a given Yale department (from the rank of Instructor through full Professor) to the percentage of women receiving Ph. D.'s in that department during the years 1968-70. In one large department, women received 51% of the doctoral degrees during these years but make up 5% of the present faculty. In another major department, the percentages are 33 and 2; in another, 24 and 0. The second figure is comparable in almost all Yale departments, and so far as we can learn, a similar disproportion prevails at other major universities. The lesson implicit in the statistics we have collected is that Yale cannot afford to perpetuate the present wasteful imbalance. The status quo today is shockingly costly, not only in money, in instructors' time, in a variety of educational resources, but also--most regrettably--in the careers of women with talent and intellectual aspirations.

Another way of sounding the problem is to compare Yale's present achievement in producing women Ph. D.'s with her own past record. During the twenties, women received eighteen percent of the doctorates awarded by Yale, ten percent during the fifties, and fourteen percent during the sixties. We are not now matching our best past record, nor does the present system allow women to fulfill themselves at Yale, once they have received the doctorate. As of this writing, only two women hold tenure faculty appointments on the Faculty of Arts and Sciences; two more at the Medical School, and one at the Law School. These figures are more chilling if one considers that, contrary to the widely-held belief, an overwhelming majority (78%) of women

holding Yale doctorates have remained employed.

It is our impression that the sexual imbalance at Yale is less often due to conscious prejudice or deliberate discrimination than to long-ingrained habitual assumptions about women as professionals, assumptions which correspond less and less to reality. There are also, obviously, sociological obstacles to professional women inherent in the roles traditionally assigned them in the family and the home. Finally there is the biological obstacle stemming from the coincidence of their childbearing years with the years of crucial professional achievement. A university cannot hope to remove the latter two obstacles, but it can render them less formidable, and it can foster a climate of more flexible expectations. We believe that this can be done without turning "flexible" into a euphemism for "inferior".

The most eloquent testimony to the problems of the woman scholar reached us in the responses to our letter of inquiry from students, past and present, in the various professional schools and from women currently on the Yale faculty. Their comments--frequently discouraged, at times impatient, sometimes bitter, always concerned--give ample evidence that at every step of the way, from graduate student to professor, women desiring professional careers face pressures and obstacles that often defeat all but the strongest and most determined.

Some instances of direct, conscious sexual discrimination are remembered. What seems to trouble more students, however, is the absence of a climate of encouragement and support to professional growth. In fact, women are themselves undermined by subtle forms of sexual discrimination that stem from being a woman in a male-dominated field. Thus a recent Ph. D. in Philosophy writes,

> It is my belief that it is not the economic forms of discrimination... which really hurt and destroy women in the university but the more subtle forms of discrimination found in interpersonal and collegial relations. Women in male-dominated fields depend so much on recognition by their male colleagues that, when they are barely tolerated as women, they become increasingly doubtful about their own merits and professional competence.

The assumption that women are less competent and less committed only too readily becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

There are departments in which "professional commitment among women [is]...little encouraged and...little expected." In medicine, for example, the notion that doctors are men and nurses are women is deeprooted in male students and faculty, and results in subtle forms of discrimination, beginning at the medical student level. The result, as one recent medical student put it, is that:

> From the first day's arrival, there is definite pressure, only occasionally overt, not to achieve. There is a lot of resentment from one's male classmates merely to our female presence--which seems to stem from the belief that women 'don't really belong' in medicine, that the only reason we're there is to pass time until marriage, that we aren't 'serious' students. It becomes difficult to compete in such an atmosphere.

In the opinion of many respondents, women are further discouraged once they have their advanced degrees. In placement, as in hiring, the tendency is to think male, so that it is not unusual for some departments to offer "the choice positions of which it hears to men first.... The assumption (not confined to Yale) is that the men are the professionals, the 'lifers,' respected fellow members of the club, the women are a luxury..." "Now that I think of it," comments another respondent,

> I find it quite remarkable that 10 years ago my Ph. D. advisor never asked me if I wanted a job nor to my knowledge recommended me for one. Apparently this is still the usual situation because considerable numbers of women are receiving Ph. D.'s...but Yale and other universities are not hearing about them.

And another faculty member voiced her concern for the single woman:

> Particular care must be taken that positions for women open up so that the single woman, who may very well feel that she has sacrificed the family life she may have wanted, will have hope of success. Presenting her with frustrations at the beginning of her career is dooming her to failure before she starts unless she is unusually strong. Men working with a single woman could at times be more sensitive about the terribly lonely position in which she finds herself, particularly if she is meeting with hostility from her colleagues.

The rigidity of an academic structure patterned to male life styles is

for many a major source of practical and psychological problems. A recent mother, who chose to reduce her teaching commitment, feels acutely her loss of position on the ladder and its effect on her future career:

> To the best of my knowledge I was the first assistant professor in [my] department to take a semester off (without pay, of course) to have a child.... I was also the first...to ask to teach part-time in the following semester because of a new baby. I never knew what was going to happen to me.... There were no precedents and no ground rules for my situation.... This year, after five years teaching at Yale, my original teaching assignment was two sections of a basic course. I argued my way into one semester of one upper-level course.... I had become someone who "fills in" where needed. I was no longer a "regular member" of the department.

Although ambiguously framed and inconsistently applied, the nepotism policy causes great difficulties. Most frequently, it is the wife who ends up at a lesser institution, in a job that "allows no time for research...and scholarly growth--and...dulls one's teaching interest and enthusiasm." Often the alternative is a position off the ladder:

> I accepted what seemed to be an ideal position: a research job with faculty rank at Yale in which I could continue my research interests on a full-time basis. In truth I must admit that I thought the position was a good one for a woman who might want to combine a career with marriage. On a short term basis such a "mix" works out quite well. On a long term basis it becomes a source of frustration. It is not rewarding psychologically or otherwise to remain in the same position over the years with no possibility of playing a greater part in university life.

The psychological stresses encountered by professional women, then, are great. The ambivalences that they are likely to encounter are summed up well by a recent Yale Ph. D.:

> The woman professional must cope with the very contradictory drives of her profession and what society expects of her. Men are fortunate that professional success and social success are judged by standards which don't conflict with each other. But what of the woman professional? She is judged by one set of standards as a professional and another set of standards as a woman. She may find that success as a professional detracts from her status as a woman, and feel, as a result, that she must somehow compensate for her professional success in order to prove herself as a woman.

The acute tension between the mother-role and the professional woman-role is eloquently expressed by a mother of three who studied full-time and now teaches full-time:

> The woman who undergoes the most agonizing conflicts is not the one who, despite husband, children, and home, is determined to forge for herself a brilliant career at all costs. Rather, she is the one who loves both her careers, as professional and as homemaker, and is forced either to take a subordinate position as the first or to neglect the second. Perhaps I am only dreaming, but it seems that equal opportunities in part-time study and employment could provide the temporary (children, after all, grow up) easing that such women so much need.

In the face of such obstacles few women reach the top of the academic hierarchy. Those who succeed often do so at great personal sacrifice. Moreover, the scarcity of women in the senior ranks at Yale, as elsewhere, is a source of anxiety for women students and younger faculty.

To one graduate student

> it is a daily reminder of [academic women's] limitations, of the fact that they are engaged in a game, playing at the exact same rules as the man, and yet rarely if ever win. When the odds are so ubiquitously poor, what sort of straight relation can they have to the endeavor? It undermines their sense of responsibility to the university and the profession.

And a student in another large department that has trained many capable women Ph. D.'s but has only one woman on the faculty, an assistant professor, points out the paradox that

> the same Department that accuses women of failure has caused their failure by denying jobs to women... My Department is not providing jobs for their women graduates, and, if this department is typical of other departments, the women being trained as equals with the men do not get an equal chance to use their skills. It is hypocritical to train people for jobs which do not exist because of prejudice, and it is reasonable to ask why the Department bothers to train women at all.

Comparable testimonies to discrimination, hidden or overt, conscious or unconscious, recur in letter after letter. These brief quotations provide a sample, though by no means a full survey, of the bases of the academic woman's disheartenment. For our Committee, and especially perhaps for its male participants, these letters from our female students and colleagues provided a startling and dismaying discovery.

The obstacles faced by women preparing themselves for careers in teaching, law, medicine, and divinity seem also to affect the careers of aspiring administrators and senior librarians. Now that Yale College is coeducational and that most professions are attracting more women applicants, the exclusively male occupancy of high administrative positions at Yale will appear increasingly out of place. One easy way to alter the traditionally male visage which the university presents both internally and externally would be to admit women to its highest administrative councils. The sexual imbalance is equally striking among senior librarians at Yale, since a large pool of professional women obviously exists on the premises. Yet very few of the senior positions are held by women, and there seems little promise of rapid change. In 1970, the percentage of women instructors at all American institutions of higher learning was lower than in 1920.

But despite all the evidences of unfulfilled careers, we are not without optimism about the long-range future. Fortunately, the manifold changes in American society appear to promise an increasingly large role for women in all professions. More women who are highly educated now marry. The division of work at home is shared more evenly today by married couples. The planning of parenthood is easier. A wider variety of living styles is becoming accepted. More aggressive claims for advancement are being made, not only by a few articulate leaders but by large numbers of individual women who are not strident but who are not resigned. In view of these and other changes, the time is ripe for intelligent experimentation. Universities like ours must find ways to be responsive without being quixotic; they must seek out modes of flexibility without sacrificing excellence.

The recommendations which follow represent our attempts to reflect this double responsibility. The Committee's most delicate decisions centered on the problem of extending privileges without creating second class members of the community. Whether or not our decisions are found acceptable, the problem will remain and must be coped with in a spirit of resourceful prudence. The alternatives are the continuing waste of human talent or the attrition of academic standards--both of them unattractive, and both increasingly unnecessary.

II. General recommendations

Before turning to specific steps to deal with specific problems, we wish to make a few general recommendations concerning women at Yale. The impact of particular reforms will largely depend upon the institutional setting in which they are made. No matter how well-intentioned individual members of this community have shown themselves to be, Yale as an institution has not made manifest a deep and authentic concern for the wasted potentialities of its female members. Until Yale comes to be, and is seen to be, hospitable to the development of their talent, there is little prospect of significantly increasing their participation.

Thus our first recommendation is to urge President Brewster to state publicly his commitment, and Yale's commitment, to the training, employment, and promotion of qualified professional women. We recommend that this statement explicitly affirm that Yale is eager to increase the participation of women at all levels, and that Yale invest energy and resources in an intensive, continuous search for women qualified to meet Yale's standards.

Furthermore, Yale should implement this statement of policy by an institutional commitment commensurate with the seriousness and importance of the participation of women. Our experience this year has repeatedly demonstrated that existing institutional techniques for dealing with the problems of women are deficient. Under the present arrangement, communication and planning about the participation of women are entirely fragmented. Faculty committees, no matter how diligent, have no easy access to relevant information, and are not integrated into day-by-day operations of the University; committees can in any case propose and counsel, but can hardly implement programmatic change. The Office of Coeducation is limited in its authority and has not been recognized by the University community as a normal channel of information and consultation. The Personnel Office may be the appropriate office for the administration of policy concerning non-faculty women employees, but it is certainly not the most effective agency to promote the interest of professional women.

Yale's fragmented and episodic concern for the participation of women is illustrated by the manner in which Yale submitted to H.E.W. an affirmative action plan about equal opportunities in employment. That plan was prepared without consultation or notification of the Office of Coeducation, relevant faculty chairmen, or of various women's groups in the University community; we learned about it only by accident. We are sure that the lack of publicity concerning the preparation of the H.E.W. report was inadvertent rather than purposefully secretive. Nonetheless, this incident illuminates the urgent need for more effective University organization to promote the legitimate interests of its women.

We therefore recommend that the University create by September, 1971 an Office of Opportunity for Women charged with the responsibility for programming and implementing Yale's commitment to the increased participation of qualified women in the Yale community. In our judgement, only a centrally located administrator can be assured of regular contacts with all those in the University community charged with recruitment, hiring, training and promotion. Only someone with authority to insist upon reporting and accountability will be a credible planner for the employment of professional women. The logical place in the University's organizational chart for such an office would be as an adjunct to the Provost. We recommend that the Office of Opportunity for Women be headed by a full-time Associate Provost, who would work with and report directly to the Provost.

The Associate Provost charged with responsibility for the Office of Opportunity for Women should be Yale's central planner for professional women. We urge strongly that this Associate Provost be a woman. She should oversee the shaping and implementation of an overall program to encourage women to come to Yale; she should also monitor the university's efforts to enlarge the opportunities for the women who are here. The Associate Provost's planning function should be supported by regular consultation with and reporting to the University community. For this purpose, the President should appoint a standing University-wide faculty committee, including the

Associate Provost as a member. The Associate Provost should also be in regular touch with department chairmen and deans, and with search committees in the various schools and colleges, to assist in their recruitment processes by helping to locate qualified women candidates.

The Office of Opportunity for Women must be adequately staffed and funded so as to enable Yale's commitment to women to be carried forward effectively. In order to plan appropriately, the Associate Provost should be knowledgeable about developments at institutions other than Yale, and should be able to send representatives to conferences and meetings elsewhere. Her office should compile facts and figures, within and outside Yale, to enable the University to evaluate its competitive posture. The office should also be responsive to the needs of the women who are here, by providing counseling where needed, by acting as an ombudsman in the event of grievances and by consulting generally with concerned women's groups at Yale.

This committee cannot, of course, detail an organizational plan for the new Office of Opportunity for Women. But we feel strongly that only a direct, authoritative Yale involvement, on a level both central and visible, will substantially alter the role of women at Yale. If the university is serious about increasing the participation of women, it must find the resources to make its commitment real.

III. Graduate study and placement

Admission

Since a woman's professional life begins in a graduate or professional school, a question concerning graduate or professional school experience was included in the letter sent to Yale alumnae. No conclusions regarding presence or absence of discrimination in admission to Yale's graduate and professional schools can be drawn from the replies received. It is clear, however, that undergraduate counseling and social pressures deflect some women from advanced study, especially in certain fields--notably the physical sciences, medicine, and divinity. A positive effort should be made to attract more women to departments and schools where they are currently represented in relatively small numbers.

Institutional policies

The university should respond constructively to the widely felt need for greater flexibility and variety in educational programs at the graduate level. The Carnegie Commission has recommended, in a recent report: "That alternative avenues by which students can earn degrees or complete a major portion of their work for a degree be expanded to increase accessibility of higher education for those to whom it is now unavailable because of work schedules, geographic location, or responsibilities in the home." (Less Time, More Options, January, 1971, p. 20).

We are encouraged by the slowly growing trend toward more flexible scheduling on the part of some schools and departments at Yale. In support of this trend we make the following recommendations:

Qualified applicants who are unable to devote full time to graduate or professional study because of family responsibilities should be admitted to part-time study. Students who elect this option should receive pro-rata financial aid on the same basis as full-time students. Part-time study should amount to no less than one half the normal expectation, and full-time study should be undertaken as soon as possible. Policies for part-time

study or training must obviously be consonant with the needs of individual schools and departments.

Efforts should be made to encourage women who hold advanced degrees but have interrupted their academic careers, to resume professional activities. To achieve this goal we recommend that the university seek funds for a fellowship program specifically designed to permit women who have interrupted academic careers to resume their scholarly work at Yale.

We recommend that Yale publicize its willingness to admit students who have interrupted their academic training. Admissions committees should be flexible, though not indulgent, in weighing the credentials of applicants who are returning to study even after interruptions of substantial length.

Students who are forced to relocate depend on flexible institutional policies regarding residency requirements, granting of transfer credits, and admission of non-degree students for study or research, in order to be able to complete degree requirements. This is true for students who go elsewhere before earning a degree at Yale, as well as for students who begin graduate programs at other institutions and then wish to complete their studies in New Haven.

We urge admission committees to be sympathetic in considering applications from this group of involuntary itinerant scholars. Those who are degree candidates at their home institutions should be permitted to continue here as special students. Others should be admitted as transfer students provided they are qualified and can meet Yale degree requirements.

We recommend that Yale degree candidates who must relocate before finishing requirements here, be permitted to complete the final phase of study for their Yale degree at another appropriate institution.

Placement

The placement of our women graduates elsewhere is clearly as important as Yale's own hiring policies. The first appointment of a young Ph.D. is

frequently the most crucial of his or her career. Those of us who guide young women professionals bear several responsibilities: fully to inform our colleagues at other institutions about women job-seekers as well as men; to inform and advise our women students regarding openings elsewhere without prejudicial assumptions concerning their mobility or aspirations; to ensure that women are not improperly relegated to the status of research associate, lecturer, or some other "safe" and less competitive position. We have encountered evidence that these responsibilities are not now conscientiously recognized--at Yale or elsewhere. One Yale department chairman reported this incident:

> On the matter of hiring and placement, I note an enormous amount of prejudice against women in academic life generally, and I am sorry to say, particularly in my subject. This used to be quite overt, but now a thin veil is usually drawn over it. A recent case in point occurred last year when I asked the chairman of the _____ department of a large university to the northeast of us whether there were any Ph.D. candidates there who would make good instructors to fill a position at Yale. He gave me the names of three men. And then I asked whether there were any women and he replied more or less, "Oh yes, there's actually a girl who is probably better than two of the men I mentioned. I don't know why I didn't think of her."

In view of experiences like this, special efforts are clearly needed to counteract our accustomed thoughtlessness. We recommend that chairmen and all faculty members concerned with placement:

<u>make a distinct and deliberate effort to place women graduates in the best possible professional positions</u>.

<u>recommend women for professional positions without regard for their marital status or presumed intentions</u>.

IV. Hiring: Problems and recommendations

The reasons for the scanty representation of women among the faculty at Yale are many and varied. Some surely involve direct discrimination against women. Some are totally beyond the university's immediate scope--originating in the social conditioning that begins with the education of young children and fosters certain preconceptions concerning relative roles in society. Nevertheless much can be done. We can identify certain bottlenecks in the academic hiring process whose removal would increase the representation of women on the Yale faculty. These obstacles exist in the attitudes and procedures within this and in other institutions that are potential sources of faculty candidates. If we cannot change personal prejudices, at least we must set institutional policy in order, and at the same time actively campaign to change the image of Yale which others have. Some observations on the major problems and some recommendations to deal with them are presented below.

Processes within Yale. The single most critical moment of an academic woman's career is the passage from graduate student to full-time faculty member. Thus we have chosen to devote more attention to this phase than to any other. Several obstacles can be recognized at once. First of all, the general university posture toward the hiring of women is not at present clear. Moreover a certain reluctance to hire women stems from the widely held presumption that women lack intellectual capacity, professional commitment, and drive. Finally, search procedures may be biased against women candidates in a variety of ways:

The departmental chairman can in many cases wield considerable power. If he is prejudiced against women, no woman candidate is likely to succeed in the competition even if suitable candidates are available.

Search procedures vary among Departments. In virtually all cases, however, the search is conducted through contacts made by letter or word of mouth between Yale faculty and personal contacts at other institutions. Some

general "flyers" may be sent out. In any case, whether accidentally or deliberately, these procedures tend to reinforce the present make-up of the Yale faculty. The inquiries normally go to men and primarily are framed in terms of "looking for a good man...." Currently there is no way to ensure that women candidates will be considered during the normal course of the search process. Furthermore, since most universities assume that we are not interested in having women here (see below), and since we have no stated policy on this issue, few women include Yale in their preliminary list of potential employers. Often candidates are sought without reliance on formal search procedures. Here the opportunity for direct or indirect discrimination is especially great.

The outside view of Yale. Yale is generally perceived to be unwilling to consider or hire women faculty. This perception seems to stem from the following causes, whether or not they are actually just.

Yale obviously has a "male chauvinist" image. It is considered to be a school dominated by men of the Old Blue tradition where women are tolerated only. Obviously this is an image which we will find very difficult to shake off. Whether or not Yale is "male chauvinist", or has been in the recent past, positive steps are needed in order to change this view that others have of us. The best way is to hire more women faculty.

Apart from the "male chauvinist" image that others have of Yale, there is the simple matter of the "tradition bound" image that may make it a less attractive place to a young woman seeking a faculty position. If young faculty members think that Yale is a place where their views are not going to weigh significantly, where they will be opposed on all sides by traditional values, they are unlikely to be willing to come and to bring the energy of their own views. Thus the University is apparently losing in competition for women faculty because they feel that Yale is a less "open" society where the young faculty member cannot easily wield influence. Even if they do not fear unusual discrimination, many academic young women seem to think that they will be stifled if they come here.

New Haven is a "company town." This means that the spouse of the faculty member is severely limited in his or her search for employment. In a time when faculty members tend to be married to potential faculty members, this is a factor of major importance. Given the nepotism presumption, we tend to lose potential men faculty members whose wives are barred from available faculty positions in the university as well as women whose husbands want similar professional positions. This constraint does not apply in a large city where there are several universities.

Finally, there is the general problem of a lack of information concerning women at Yale. We must do more to emphasize the fact that there are excellent women scholars on the faculty--and to advertise Yale's commitment to hiring more women faculty.

Recommendations

A stated policy and its enforcement. The Yale administration should affirm publicly the university's intention to consider without prejudice women as well as men for all open positions. Since faculty hiring is conducted primarily at the departmental level, it is difficult to establish general search policies. Therefore we recommend that the various appointments committees, along with the Deans and Provost, take direct responsibility for ensuring the sexual equity of departmental recruiting efforts. We recommend that all proposals of candidates to a superior committee be required to contain a statement that candidates of both sexes have been canvassed. It should be the responsibility of the appointments committees, and particularly of the deans who sit upon them, to pursue this question with the chairman before approving the nomination. We hope that this requirement will lead chairmen to weigh more actively the abilities of potential women candidates.

A form letter stating Yale's position on recruiting women faculty. It is essential that the university prepare a simple document stating that it is an equal opportunity employer, and that it seeks to increase the number of women on the faculty. This statement would be required for inclusion with all documents sent out in connection with faculty search procedures. Copies

should be available in large numbers from the Provost's office. Such a letter has the double function of committing the university to a policy and of stating the policy clearly to everyone outside the university.

Additional tenure appointments. While it is important for the university to add women faculty at all levels, we think that the immediate addition of numbers of established senior scholars would play a very significant role in improving the morale of Yale women and in changing the image of Yale in the country at large. The committee has carefully considered the possibility of making special funds available for adding new faculty positions for women. This strategy is particularly tempting at a time when general funds for faculty positions at Yale are scarce and the total number of positions available is small. On the whole we are reluctant to recommend that this device be used, because of the risks of appearing to place women in an "inferior" category. What we are striving for ultimately is an equality of consideration in which special favors are unnecessary. In the meantime, however, we believe that the university should solicit and set aside funds for the recruitment of senior women professors.

We therefore recommend that the University temporarily set aside a number of tenure faculty positions for the specific purpose of recruiting senior women academicians until such time as a more favorable balance of representation has been achieved.

Increasing the pool of potential applicants for faculty positions at Yale. Even though the number of faculty positions that will be filled in the next year or so may be small, Yale must take the following steps to increase the total number of women who might be considered for faculty positions:

It has been customary not to recruit women who appear "immovable" from their present positions because their husbands are presumed to be unwilling to move. This practice is self defeating. Yale should not hesitate to give such scholars the opportunity to make their own choice.

The Faculty Handbook discusses employment of members of the same family as follows: (p. 57)

> In a community like New Haven, where the university is the largest employer of professional trained people, it is quite natural that several members of a family should frequently be employed by the university. The presumption is that no two members of the same family can be employed by the same academic department at the same time. In order to avoid embarrassment to all concerned, the university is responsible for ensuring that, in such cases, appointments are made on the merits of the persons involved.

This statement is sufficiently vague to allow more than one interpretation. We recommend that there be no stated or implied presumption against the employment of two members of the same family by the same academic department. We recognize that certain problems and conflicts may arise, especially in small departments, but we believe that these can be handled if judgement and prudence are exercised. The safeguards outlined in the Faculty Handbook (p. 58), to be used when considering the appointment of two members of a family to the same department, are in our view, adequate to assure that appointments will be made on the basis of merit.

Potential candidates who are not residents of the immediate New Haven area should not be excluded from consideration. Even though one spouse may be tied to a position in New York or at Trinity, Wesleyan, Connecticut College, or elsewhere in the nearby area, the couple might choose to live halfway between that community and New Haven.

There are tacit rules concerning the relation of age and rank. Ordinarily people are not appointed to the Assistant Professor rank if they are older than about 35. There may be good reasons for this preclusion. However, its application should be relaxed for women scholars who have spent time as research associates or lecturers, or who have interrupted their careers to raise young children. If the candidate is otherwise suited for a position at a given level, she ought not to be barred from consideration solely on the grounds of age.

New Ph.D.'s are sometimes discouraged from seeking regular faculty positions solely because they are women. Instead, they become research associates or lecturers (see section V below). The discriminatory practices involved here ought not to bar such women from future positions on the regular academic ladder. The university can increase its pool of potential candidates by considering women who currently hold such positions at Yale and elsewhere.

Many departments do not hire their own new Ph.D.'s as faculty members. Again, while there are good reasons for this preclusion, its application should be relaxed in order to increase the pool of women candidates. If our own Ph.D.'s are truly outstanding in the competition, they should not be automatically barred for consideration.

Many Yale faculty members think that women cannot make good scholars. The best way to show them that women are capable of excellence in scholarship is to bring outstanding women scholars here as Visiting Faculty. Special funds should be made available from the university for this purpose; special endowments might also be solicited. Of course it could not possibly be a substitute for our increase in the number of full-time women Yale professors. But the educational value of such a procedure in raising the prestige of the woman scholar and in changing the view of Yale that others perceive, would be significant.

V. Professional women at Yale

The status of professional women at Yale is reflected by the insignificant number who currently hold positions at the professorial ranks and at the higher echelons of administration. (See above, p. 2) The record is better at the non-tenure ranks, but even here the percentage of women is very low. Only in positions off the academic ladder can substantial numbers of women be found. On or off the ladder, almost all administrative authority is vested in men.

In order to achieve significant participation of women in teaching and administration, the university must be willing to accommodate a variety of life styles for women as well as for men. At present it is prepared primarily to hire women who most closely resemble academic men, or who can organize their lives, however uncomfortably, into an environment created for men. To treat all persons equally may favor one group over another.

This committee does not recommend that Yale adopt different criteria for the appointment or promotion of men and women. Existing criteria, however, should be applied with sufficient flexibility to accommodate the needs of both men and women. We make the following recommendations:

A faculty member who has family commitments requiring him or her to reduce the amount of time devoted to university responsibilities should be permitted to request the reduction in appointment to not less than half-time. Appointment to part-time status should be granted on the condition that such status is temporary. Part-time appointments should not carry any reduction in status or rank, and should be accompanied by a pro-rata adjustment of sabbatical leave eligibility and fringe benefits.

Women faculty members should be eligible for six months maternity leave, with retention of benefits and seniority. No more than two maternity leaves should be granted to any faculty member.

Faculty members who hold, or have held, part-time faculty appointments at Yale, or who have taken maternity leave, should be allowed to request an extension of their existing term in rank. The extension granted should not normally exceed two years.

Rapidity of promotion is often influenced by the receipt of offers from other institutions. Married women are less likely to receive such offers because of their assumed reluctance to move elsewhere. The Provost's Office should assume the responsibility for reviewing at regular intervals the salaries and rates of promotion of faculty women, to ensure that men and women of similar training and achievement are equally rewarded. Such a review is needed not only for members of the faculty but also for women in the administration, research staff, library staff, and other positions calling for professional skills.

So few women are presently employed in any given department or school that it is difficult to determine conclusively the fairness of a given individual's salary. In the one school for which we have sufficient figures--the School of Medicine--the inequality is glaring. (See Appendix III -- Salaries of men and women with doctorates in the School of Medicine.) We urge the administration of that school to take remedial steps immediately.

Yale offers--to women and to men--some professional positions not on the academic ladder. The position of lecturer is of particular concern to us. This position is often attractive to women because it offers opportunities for flexibility in scheduling and in commitment; it can be part-time or full-time. At present, however, these positions are often ill defined at the outset and disappointing in their long term effect.

We have encountered considerable ignorance and confusion regarding the position of Lecturer. There appear to be inconsistencies in so vital a matter as the awarding of leaves with salary. The individuals concerned have at least the right to know what benefits they can expect. We recommend that the Faculty Handbook indicate fully and clearly the responsibilities and

privileges of lecturers and senior lecturers, including leaves, fringe benefits, and the mechanism for terminating the appointment.

The Provost's Office should make a periodic review of men and women holding the appointment of lecturer and research associate, to ensure that their rank and salary are in each case commensurate with their responsibilities and achievements. (See Appendix I, The special problem of the Research Associate).

The availability of day care and other supporting services for the home would enable some individuals to hold full-time positions who otherwise are unable to do so. We recommend that the university provide, as far as feasible, technical advice, space, and institutional support to groups working to establish such services.

VI. Summary of recommendations

Our study of the status of academic women at Yale has revealed that an unacceptably high number of women at Yale do not reach the professional fulfillment to which their training ought to entitle them. Women receive 14% of the doctorates at Yale, yet they account for only 3% of appointments at assistant professor rank and above, in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. This number must be contrasted with figures obtained in a recent survey conducted by the Graduate School which indicated that 78% of women holding Yale doctorates are currently employed. The absence of women at the administrative level of the university is equally glaring.

In order to remedy these imbalances our committee makes the following recommendations:

1. We urge President Brewster to state publicly his commitment, and Yale's commitment, to the training, employment, and promotion of qualified professional women. We recommend that this statement explicitly affirm that Yale is eager to increase the participation of women at all levels and all ranks, and invest its energy and resources in an intensive, continuous search for women qualified to meet Yale's standards.

2. We recommend that the University create by September 1971 an Office of Opportunity for Women charged with the responsibility for implementing Yale's commitment to the increased participation of qualified women in the Yale community; that this office be headed by a full-time Associate Provost, preferably a woman, who would work with and report directly to the Provost. The Associate Provost's planning function should be supported by regular consultation with and reporting to the University community. For this purpose, the President should appoint a standing University-wide faculty committee, including the Associate Provost as a member.

Our recommendations pertaining to graduate study and placement are as follows:

3. that a positive effort should be made to attract more women students to departments and schools where they are currently represented in relatively small numbers.

4. that qualified applicants who are unable to devote full time to graduate or professional study because of family responsibilities be admitted to part-time study.

5. that the university seek funds for a postdoctoral fellowship program specifically designed to permit women who have interrupted academic careers to resume their scholarly work at Yale.

6. that Yale publicize its willingness to admit students who have interrupted their academic training.

7. that admissions committees be urged to be sympathetic in considering applications from involuntary itinerant scholars, who were forced to relocate after having begun degree study elsewhere.

8. that degree candidates who must relocate before finishing requirements at Yale, be permitted to complete the final phase of study for their Yale degree at another appropriate institution.

9. that chairmen and faculty members concerned with placement make a distinct and deliberate effort to place women graduates in the best possible professional positions, and that they recommend women for professional positions without regard for marital status or presumed intentions.

Our recommendations pertaining to hiring are as follows:

10. that all proposals of candidates to a superior committee be required to contain a statement that candidates of both sexes have been canvassed.

11. that the Yale administration affirm publicly the university's intention to consider, without prejudice, women as well as men for all open positions, and that the university prepare a simple document stating that it is an equal opportunity employer, and that it seeks to increase the number of women on the faculty. This statement would be required for inclusion with all documents sent out in connection with faculty search procedures.

12. that the university temporarily set aside a number of tenure faculty positions for the specific purpose of recruiting senior women academicians, until such time as a more favorable balance of representation has been achieved.

13. that Yale recruit women even though they may appear "immovable" because their husbands are presumed to be unwilling to move.

14. that there be no stated or implied presumption against the employment of two members of the same family by the same academic department.

15. that potential candidates who are not residents of the immediate New Haven area should not be excluded from consideration. Even though one spouse may be tied to a position in New York or elsewhere in the nearby area, the couple might choose to live halfway between that community and New Haven.

16. that a candidate who is otherwise suited for a position at a given level, ought not be barred from consideration solely on grounds of age.

17. that the university try to increase its pool of potential candidates by considering women who currently hold positions as lecturers or research associates at Yale and elsewhere.

18. that if our own Ph. D. 's are truly outstanding they should not be automatically barred from consideration, even though many departments do not normally hire their own Ph. D. 's as faculty members.

19. that Yale secure funds to bring women to Yale as visiting faculty.

Our recommendations pertaining to conditions of employment of professional women are as follows:

20. that faculty members who have family commitments requiring them to reduce the amount of time devoted to university responsibilities be permitted to request the reduction in appointments to not less than half-time status.

21. that women be eligible for six months maternity leave, with retention of benefits and seniority.

22. that faculty members who hold, or have held, part-time faculty appointments at Yale, or who have taken maternity leave, be allowed to request an extension of their existing term in rank. The extension granted should not normally exceed two years.

23. that the Provost's Office assume the responsibility for reviewing at regular intervals the salaries and rates of promotion of faculty women and of women in administrative posts, to ensure that men and women of similar training and achievement are equally rewarded.

24. that the responsibilities and privileges of lecturers and senior lecturers be clearly and fully stated in the Faculty Handbook, in order to reduce the ignorance and confusion regarding positions in the lecturer category.

25. that the Provost's Office make a periodic review of men and women holding the appointment of lecturer and research associate, to ensure that their rank and salary are in each case commensurate with their responsibilities and achievements.

26. that the university provide, as far as feasible, technical advice, space, and institutional support to groups working to establish day care and other supporting services for the home.

Appendix I.

The Special Problem of the Research Associate

Within the university, and particularly the sciences, large numbers of women hold the corporation appointment of "research associate". They are responsible in the technical sense for a very great deal of the research conducted at Yale and in many cases even hold their own research grants (under the sponsorship of faculty members on the Faculty of Arts and Sciences). The extent to which research associates participate in departmental activities varies. These are primarily research appointments and normally the research associate is shielded from the distractions of faculty responsibility by the "rules" of the appointment. In response to considerable dissatisfaction expressed by research associates who wrote us, we offer the following observations.

The Faculty Handbook distinguishes three grades of postdoctoral research positions in the university, aside from the postdoctoral fellow. These are: research staff (with salary not exceeding that of an assistant professor), research associate (salary not exceeding that of an associate professor), and senior research associate (salary not exceeding that of a full professor). These distinctions need to be supplemented with further information: on the length of appointment, the criteria and mechanisms for promotion, the minimum salary for a given rank (at least as important as the maximum salary), and all other privileges and responsibilities which can be specified.

The conditions of the research associates' work stem largely from the fact that these are research, rather than teaching, appointments. Nevertheless, in many cases research associates sit on departmental committees, supervise the work of graduate students, and receive temporary appointments as lecturers in order to teach their special fields. While this might seem to be an ideal situation for the dedicated researcher, in fact it is fraught with frustration and the sense of exploitation. This is because a

very large number of women hold these positions, but hold them reluctantly, as the only respectable professional appointment available to them, all the while aspiring to professorial status. While many have deliberately and freely chosen this career, others have chosen it because faculty positions traditionally have not been open to women, or because it is the only professional position where part-time work has been possible. A few have even left professorships (for positions as lecturer or research associate) with little opportunity to return to "ladder" positions.

We do not recommend that the regulations concerning the responsibilities of research associates be further tightened. We cannot recommend they be excluded from acting as occasional lecturers, or from supervision of graduate students in their own field, if it is perfectly clear both to the department and the individual that there is no exploitation. It would be wrong to bar from such activities those who would welcome them and accept the limitations in good faith. However the new Office of Opportunities for Women should pay particular attention to the dangers inherent in the system and especially to the question of status and salary. Since all such appointments are funded from research grants, the tendency is to keep the researcher at a low level and to promote him or her rarely. Obviously the researcher must take care not to be priced out of the market; but Yale must also take care not to disregard the professional aspirations of its research workers. Their contributions to the university deserve warmer recognition and higher dignity than they have consistently received.

Appendix II. Departmental Statistics*

ELEVEN MAJOR DEPARTMENTS - YALE UNIVERSITY

HUMANITIES

English

	Total	# Women	% Women
I. Matriculants (1955-59)	182	67	37%
II. Ph.D.'s Awarded to above group (as of June 1966)	97	33	34%
III. Matriculants (1967/68 - 1969/70)	134	45	34%
IV. Ph.D.'s Awarded (12/67 - 12/70)	79	28	35%
V. Department Faculty			
Professors	23	1	
Assoc. Professors	3	0	
Asst. Professors	36	6	
Instructors	0	0	
Total	62	7	11.3%

*As of October 1970

Appendix II. Departmental Statistics*

ELEVEN MAJOR DEPARTMENTS - YALE UNIVERSITY

HUMANITIES

History

	Total	# Women	% Women
I. Matriculants (1955-59)	109	18	16%
II. Ph.D.'s Awarded to above group (as of June 1966)	61	10	16%
III. Matriculants (1967/68 - 1969/70)	104	19	18%
IV. Ph.D.'s Awarded (12/67 - 12/70)	60	9	15%
V. Department Faculty			
Professors	30	0	
Assoc. Professors	10	0	
Asst. Professors	20	1	
Instructors	1	0	
Total	61	1	1.6%

*As of October 1970

Appendix II. Departmental Statistics*

ELEVEN MAJOR DEPARTMENTS - YALE UNIVERSITY

HUMANITIES

Philosophy

		Total	# Women	% Women
I.	Matriculants (1955-59)	100	18	18%
II.	Ph.D.'s Awarded to above group (as of June 1966)	60	10	17%
III.	Matriculants (1967/68 - 1969/70)	64	11	17%
IV.	Ph.D.'s Awarded (12/67 - 12/70)	41	7	17%
V.	Department Faculty			
	Professors	8	0	
	Assoc. Professors	3	0	
	Asst. Professors	16	2	
	Instructors	0	0	
	Total	27	2	7.4%

*As of October 1970

Appendix II. Departmental Statistics*

ELEVEN MAJOR DEPARTMENTS - YALE UNIVERSITY

HUMANITIES

Romance Languages**

		Total	# Women	% Women
I.	Matriculants (1955-59)	93	28	30%
II.	Ph.D.'s Awarded to above group (as of June 1966)	48	12	25%
III.	Matriculants (1967/68 - 1969/70)	114	72	63%
IV.	Ph.D.'s Awarded (12/67 - 12/70)	53	27	51%
V.	Department Faculty			
	Professors	13	0	
	Assoc. Professors	7	0	
	Asst. Professors	17	1	
	Instructors	3	1	
	Total	40	2	5%

*As of October 1970
**French, Italian, Spanish combined

Appendix II. Departmental Statistics*

ELEVEN MAJOR DEPARTMENTS - YALE UNIVERSITY

NATURAL SCIENCES

Biology

	Total	# Women	% Women
I. Matriculants (1955-59)	78	20	26%
II. Ph.D.'s Awarded to above group (as of June 1966)	53	10	19%
III. Matriculants (1967/68 - 1969/70)	107	30	28%
IV. Ph.D.'s Awarded (12/67 - 12/70)	49	16	33%
V. Department Faculty			
Professors	17	0	
Assoc. Professors	15	0	
Asst. Professors	8	1	
Instructors	2	0	
Total	42	1	2.4%

*As of October 1970

Appendix II. Departmental Statistics*

ELEVEN MAJOR DEPARTMENTS - YALE UNIVERSITY

NATURAL SCIENCES

Chemistry

	Total	# Women	% Women
I. Matriculants (1955-59)	124	17	14%
II. Ph.D.'s Awarded to above group (as of June 1966)	89	7	8%
III. Matriculants (1967/68 - 1969/70)	114	20	17%
IV. Ph.D.'s Awarded (12/67 - 12/70)	80	6	7%
V. Department Faculty			
Professors	16	0	
Assoc. Professors	5	0	
Asst. Professors	7	0	
Instructors	1	0	
Total	29	0	0

*As of October 1970

Appendix II. Departmental Statistics*

ELEVEN MAJOR DEPARTMENTS - YALE UNIVERSITY

NATURAL SCIENCES

Physics

	Total	# Women	% Women
I. Matriculants (1955-59)	131	3	2%
II. Ph.D.'s Awarded to above group (as of June 1966)	94	1	1%
III. Matriculants (1967/68 - 1969/70)	95	4	4%
IV. Ph.D.'s Awarded (12/67 - 12/70)	77	2	3%
V. Department Faculty			
Professors	18	0	
Assoc. Professors	5	0	
Asst. Professors	15	0	
Instructors	9	1	
Total	47	1	0

*As of October 1970

Appendix II. Departmental Statistics*

ELEVEN MAJOR DEPARTMENTS - YALE UNIVERSITY

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Economics

	Total	# Women	% Women
I. Matriculants (1955-59)	106	11	10%
II. Ph.D.'s Awarded to above group (as of June 1966)	56	2	4%
III. Matriculants (1967/68 - 1969/70)	111	11	10%
IV. Ph.D.'s Awarded (12/67 - 12/70)	64	6	9%
V. Department Faculty			
Professors	26	0	
Assoc. Professors	10	0	
Asst. Professors	16	1	
Instructors	0	0	
Total	52	1	2%

* As of October 1970

Appendix II. Departmental Statistics*

ELEVEN MAJOR DEPARTMENTS - YALE UNIVERSITY

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Political Science

	Total	# Women	% Women
I. Matriculants (1955-59)	77	12	16%
II. Ph.D.'s Awarded to above group (as of June 1966)	28	2	7%
III. Matriculants (1967/68 - 1969/70)	55	5	9%
IV. Ph.D.'s Awarded (12/67 - 12/70)	37	3	8%
V. Department Faculty			
Professors	15	0	
Assoc. Professors	5	0	
Asst. Professors	17	0	
Instructors	0	0	
Total	37	0	0

*As of October 1970

Appendix II. Departmental Statistics*

ELEVEN MAJOR DEPARTMENTS - YALE UNIVERSITY

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Psychology

	Total	# Women	% Women
I. Matriculants (1955-59)	73	19	26%
II. Ph.D.'s Awarded to above group (as of June 1966)	54	11	20%
III. Matriculants (1967/68 - 1969/70)	80	28	35%
IV. Ph.D.'s Awarded (12/67 - 12/70)	47	16	34%
V. Department Faculty			
Professors	17	0	
Assoc. Professors	11	1	
Asst. Professors	21	3	
Instructors	0	0	
Total	49	4	8%

*As of October 1970

Appendix II. Departmental Statistics*

ELEVEN MAJOR DEPARTMENTS - YALE UNIVERSITY

SOCIAL SCIENCES

		Sociology		
		Total	# Women	% Women
I.	Matriculants (1955-59)	47	13	28%
II.	Ph.D.'s Awarded to above group (as of June 1966)	24	5	21%
III.	Matriculants (1967/68 - 1969/70)	52	16	31%
IV.	Ph.D.'s Awarded (12/67 - 12/70)	21	5	24%
V.	Department Faculty			
	Professors	10	0	
	Assoc. Professors	5	0	
	Asst. Professors	8	0	
	Instructors	0	0	
	Total	23	0	0

*As of October 1970

WOMEN ON THE FACULTY - ELEVEN MAJOR DEPARTMENTS *

Department	Professors Total	Professors # Women	Assoc. Professors Total	Assoc. Professors # Women	Asst. Professors Total	Asst. Professors # Women	Instructors Total	Instructors # Women	Women/Faculty	% Women
English	23	1	3	0	36	6	0	0	7/62	11.3%
History	30	0	10	0	20	1	1	0	1/61	1.6%
Philosophy	8	0	3	0	16	2	0	0	2/27	7.4%
Romance (combined)	13	0	7	0	17	1	3	1	2/40	5%
**********										
Biology	17	0	15	0	8	1	2	0	1/42	2.4%
Chemistry	16	0	5	0	7	0	1	0	0/29	0
Physics	18	0	5	0	15	0	9	1	1/47	2%
**********										
Economics	26	0	10	0	16	1	0	0	1/52	2%
Political Science	15	0	5	0	17	0	0	0	0/37	0
Psychology	17	0	11	1	21	3	0	0	4/49	8%
Sociology	10	0	5	0	8	0	0	0	0/23	0
Totals	193	1	79	1	181	15	16	2	19/469	4%
Per Cent Women in each category		.5%		1.3%		8.2%		12.5%		

* As of October 1970